### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION

GENERAL LAND OFFICE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Plaintiff,

No. A-17-CA-00538-SS

v.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, et al.,

Defendants.

### **DECLARATION OF THEODORE HADZI-ANTICH**

Declarant, Theodore Hadzi-Antich, states as follows:

- I am a practicing attorney and currently serve as the Senior Attorney in the Center for the American Future of the Texas Public Policy Foundation ("TPPF").
- 2. I have been a member in good standing of the Maryland Bar since 1976, the District of Columbia Bar since 1979, the New York Bar since 1987, the Tennessee Bar since 2006, and the California Bar since 2010. I am currently in "active" status in New York and California and "inactive" in Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Tennessee. I am also a member of the bars of the following United States appellate courts: Ninth Circuit, Seventh Circuit, Fifth Circuit, D.C. Circuit, and I am a member of United States district courts in the Northern and Western districts of Texas and the Northern and Western districts of California. I am also a member of the United States Supreme Court Bar.
- 3. During my 40-plus years of practice as an environmental lawyer, I have served as an attorney at the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the law firm of Dechert Price and Rhoads, the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation, the law firm

- of Jaeckle, Fleishmann & Mugel, the Law Firm of Theodore Hadzi-Antich, the Pacific Legal Foundation and the Texas Public Policy Foundation. I have also served as both an adjunct professor and full-time assistant professor teaching environmental law.
- 4. I have served as lead counsel on a variety of cases involving the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, and I have counseled clients in connection with those federal statues as well as Superfund, TSCA, and FIFRA.
- 5. TPPF was retained to represent the General Land Office of the State of Texas in the instant action.
- 6. The purpose of this declaration is to set forth record evidence of the attorneys' fees incurred in connection with the above-captioned lawsuit. The TPPF lawyers who have worked on this case, their respective hourly rates, and the hours expended are detailed in Exhibit A of this declaration. The rates charged by Plaintiff's counsel are reasonable and are lower than those set forth in the United States Attorney's Office Fees Matrix for the years 2015-2019 (the "USAO Matrix"), a copy of which is set forth in Exhibit B of this declaration. <a href="https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/file/796471/download">https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/file/796471/download</a> (last visited on March 8, 2020). The USAO Matrix is updated periodically by the office of the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia and "is intended for use in cases in which a feeshifting statute permits the prevailing party to recover 'reasonable' attorney's fees." See footnote 1 of Exhibit B. The USAO Matrix "was calculated from average hourly rates reported in 2011 survey data for the D.C. metropolitan area, which rates were adjusted for inflation with the Producer Price Index-Office of Lawyers." Id. at footnote 2. Although the USAO Matrix by its terms applies only in the District of Columbia, my

- understanding is that these rates are in line with, or below, the fees charged in the Austin metropolitan area by attorneys of like experience, skill, and reputation for similar work.
- As the lead attorney on this case, I assigned work on this matter to my former associate attorney, Erin Wilcox, to my current associate attorney, Ryan D. Walters, and to my paralegal/secretary, Yvonne Simental, at the lowest hourly rate consistent with the skills and time demands necessary to effectively litigate this matter. Through these efforts, I was able to limit the amount of time for which recovery is sought to 1100.45 attorney hours and 53.25 paralegal hours, which is a reasonable amount of time given the complexity of the case. In addition, my direct supervisor, Robert Henneke, spent 55.75 attorney hours overseeing certain aspects of the case, which also is a reasonable amount of time given the complexities of the case. All hourly rates shown in Exhibit A are the actual hourly rates used by TPPF for each attorney for all litigated matters, as follows: T. Hadzi-Antich at \$450 per hour, E. Wilcox at \$185 per hour, R. Walters at \$225 per hour, and R. Henneke at \$350 per hour. The same is true for the paralegal assistant, Y. Simental, at the rate of \$75 per hour.
- 8. The total attorney and paralegal time for which recovery is sought is \$372,733.75.
- 9. Because TPPF is a non-profit, neither its client in this litigation, the General Land Office of the State of Texas, nor any other person, organization, or entity was billed for any attorney or paralegal time devoted to this case.
- 10. As the lead attorney responsible for this case, I reviewed the attached spreadsheet attached as Exhibit A and determined that the listed fees are reasonable after evaluating the following factors:
  - The time and labor required;

- The novelty and difficulty of the questions presented;
- The skill required to perform the legal services properly;
- The preclusion of work on other potential matters due to acceptance of the case;
- The customary fee;
- That the fee is based on an hourly rate rather than contingent;
- Time limitations imposed by the circumstances of the case;
- The issues involved and the results obtained;
- The experience, reputation, and ability of the attorneys and paralegal;
- Awards in similar cases.
- 11. It is the regular practice of TPPF's Center for the American Future to make and keep the types of records set forth in the attachment. These records have been in the custody, supervision and control of TPPF employees and accurately reflect the reasonable attorneys' fees that I have concluded in my professional judgment are appropriate for recovery in this matter.
- 12. In addition, TPPF's actual out-of-pocket and unreimbursed expenses recoverable under the ESA amount to \$8,454.42, as set forth in Exhibit C. I have personally reviewed such expenses and have determined that they are authorized and reasonable.
- 13. Accordingly, attorneys' fees and costs are sought in the total amount of \$381,188.17.
- 14. After the issuance of the mandate by the Court of Appeals and pursuant to Local Rule CV-7(1) the parties conferred in an effort to settle the amount of fees and costs that should be recovered by plaintiff. Although they were not able to settle the matter before the expiration of plaintiff's deadline to file the motion for fees and costs recovery, they

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY Document 85-1 Filed 03/20/20 Page 5 of 34

agreed to file a joint motion to put the matter in abeyance pending settlement

negotiations. That joint motion is being filed on this day.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, to the best of my

knowledge, and that this declaration was executed on March 20, 2020 in Sacramento, California.

/s/Theodore Hadzi-Antich

THEODORE HADZI-ANTICH

# **EXHIBIT A**

# GLO v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, et al

9/14/2016	9/13/2016	9/13/2016	9/12/2016		9/12/2016	9/12/2016	9/9/2016	9/8/2016	9/7/2016	9/7/2016	6/14/2016		6/10/2016		6/7/2016	6/7/2016		6/7/2016		6/4/2016		6/4/2016		6/3/2016		1/12/2016		Date	<b>J</b>
E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	R. Henneke		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke		R. Henneke		R. Henneke	R. Henneke		R. Henneke		R. Henneke		R. Henneke		T. Hadzi-Antich		R. Henneke		Statt	2
Legal research/writing	Potential case meeting	Legal research/writing	status	Telephonce conference with S. Combs regarding case	Legal research/writing	Potential case meeting	Legal research	Legal research	Potential case meeting	Legal research	strategy	Telephone conference with S. Combs regarding trial	GCW litigation strategy, potential legal claims to assert	Meeting with T. Hadzi-Antich and J. Stonedale regarding	Email exchange with S. Combs		Telephone conference with N. Marzulla regarding litigation		Review memo from J. Stonedale regarding ESA Article III		Email CAF regarding analysis of supporting and related	FWS denial of 90 day status review	Review supporting and related material document regarding		Review of developmental issues regarding case challenging	filing	Email exchange with Alan Glen re: supplemental petition	lask	1 -
4	0.5	3.5	0.25		4.25	0.5	2.75	ω	0.5	1.5	0.25		1.25		1.5	0.25		0.25		0.25		_		1.50		0.25		Time	!
185		185					185	185	185	185			350			350		350		350		350		450		350		Rate	J
	\$									\$ 27			\$ 43			<del>\$</del>		<del>\$</del>		8		\$ 35		\$ 67		\$		lotal	I
740.00	2.50	7.50	7.50		6.25	92.50	8.75	555.00	2.50	277.50	7.50		437.50		525.00	87.50		87.50		87.50		350.00		675.00		87.50		_	-

### Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY Document 85-1 Filed 03/20/20 Page 8 of 34

Case	1:17	-cv-0	0538-LY	Docu	ıment	85	-1	File	d 03/2	20/	20	Р	age	8 9	of	34					
10/21/2016 10/21/2016	10/20/2016	10/18/2016	10/14/2016		10/12/2016	10/3/2016	10/3/2016		10/3/2016	9/30/2016	9/28/2016	9/27/2016	9/26/2016	9/23/2016	9/22/2016	9/20/2016	9/19/2016	9/16/2016	9/16/2016	9/15/2016	Date
E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	•	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	Staff
Research on NEPA, application to critical habitat designations, potential application to listing and delisting decisions under ESA, treatment in circuit courts Further writing on memorandum	potential case	Continued research on NEPA and ESA in the circuit courts	Cir. and beyond, and FRCP amendments pertaining to communications with expert witnesses and discoverable information	Research on NEPA and intersection with ESA in 5th, 6th, 9th and 10th Circuits, continuing violation theories in 5th	Edit and additional research/content for Warbler memo regarding standing, statue of limitations and tone	Edit memorandum	be overturned if purpose of action is impossible to achieve	Research cases involving claims that agency action should	Research on 5th and 10th Cir. cass involving claims that species will not survive unless CH is designated	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research/writing	Legal research	Legal research/writing	Task
	0.75	N	ن ن		_	_	1.5		_	IJ	4.5	4	4.25	ω	2.75	3.5	4.25	3.5	_		Time
185 \$	185 \$	185 \$	185 \$		185 \$	185 \$			185 \$	185 \$	185 \$					185 \$		185 \$	185 \$	185 \$	Rate
185.00 185.00	138.75	370.00	925.00		185.00	185.00	277.50		185.00	925.00	832.50	740.00	786.25	555.00	508.75	647.50	786.25	647.50	185.00	925.00	Total

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY Document 85-1 Filed 03/20/20 Page 9 of 34

02/01/2017	01/31/2017	1/30/2017	01/30/2017	01/30/2017	01/30/2017	01/27/2017	01/27/2017	01/24/2017	01/24/2017	01/18/2017	01/04/2017		01/04/2017	12/23/2016	12/22/2016		12/21/2016	12/12/2016	11/14/2016		11/11/2016		11/4/2016		11/3/2016	10/24/2016	10/24/2016		Date	<b>,</b>
E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox		Stair	) 1) 1)
Commuincation with co-counsel regarding venue	Edits to 60 day letter	Review and edit second draft of 60-day notice letter	Draft venue memorandum	Communication with client regarding 60 day letter	Edits to 60 day letter	Communication with client regarding 60 day letter	Draft venue memorandum	Communication with client regarding 60 day letter	Draft venue memorandum	Draft 60 day letter	Representation Agreement	Telephone conference with M. Havens regarding GLO	Confer with co-counsel about telephone call	Draft 60 day notice letter	lawsuit	Confer with GLO General Counsel regarding participation in	Draft 60 day notice letter	Edits to memo in anticipation of GLO meeting	with CAF team regarding same	Edits to Warbler short and long memos; communication	with CAF team regarding same	Edits to Warbler short and long memos; communication	form of Warbler memorandum	Find and read pleadings related to petition for rehearing en banc in <i>Markle v. FWS</i> ; send to T. Hadzi-Antich; edit short	Research and edit potential case memorandum	Add research to memorandum	courts	requirements, intersection of NEPA and ESA in circuit		T));
0.50	1.00	2.70	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	2.50	0.50	2.00	1.50	0.25		0.25	_	0.25		_	0.5	0.25		0.75		0.75		ω	_	2		IIme	<u>1</u>
185 \$	185 \$						185 \$							185 \$				185 \$			185 \$		185 \$			185 \$			Kate	<b>j</b>
92.50	185.00	1,215.00	185.00	92.50	185.00	92.50	462.50	92.50	370.00	277.50	87.50		46.25	185.00	87.50		185.00	92.50	46.25		138.75		138.75		555.00	185.00	370.00		lotal	1

Case 1:17	7-cv-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 10 of 34	
04/05/2017 04/05/2017 04/06/2017 04/06/2017 04/07/2017 04/07/2017 04/12/2017	03/17/2017 03/23/2017 03/29/2017 04/03/2017 04/04/2017	03/09/2017 03/10/2017 03/13/2017 03/13/2017 03/16/2017 03/17/2017	02/24/2017 02/24/2017 02/24/2017 03/08/2017 03/08/2017 03/09/2017	02/01/2017 02/22/2017 02/23/2017 02/23/2017 02/23/2017 02/24/2017 02/24/2017	Date
	T. Hadzi-Antich  E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich		R. Henneke R. Henneke T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich R. Henneke	Staff
•	Review and edit Warbler complaint Research on Warbler statistics for T. Hadzi-Antich media interview Review edits to Complaint with T. Hadzi-Antich Warbler complaint edits Memorandum to R. Henneke regarding the case	Confer with T. Hadzi-Antich regarding litigation strategy and potential amicus partners Discuss Complaint strategy with T. Hadzi-Antich Conference call Draft Warbler Complaint Draft Warbler Complaint	Telephone conference with GLO General Counsel regarding case update Email M. Barenblat regarding 60 day NOI letter Attention to Warbler complaint Research on standing for Complaint Draft Complaint	Review of appraisal of the TX GLO property we will wuse for injury-in-fact purposes regarding dimunition in value Research and draft venue and transfer memo Draft venue and transfer memo Work on the venue issues in Warbler case Attention to details regarding venue issues and which court is best for us  Review and revise 60 day NOI letter	Task
1.70 3.00 1.00 1.00 0.70	5.70 0.75 0.75 2.50 1.00	0.25 0.50 1.00 4.00 3.00	0.50 0.25 1.50 1.00	1.00 3.50 1.50 2.90 2.70	Time
185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$			350 \$ 350 \$ 185 \$	450 \$ 185 \$ 450 \$ 350 \$	Rate
765.00 555.00 185.00 185.00 315.00 185.00	2,565.00 138.75 138.75 462.50 450.00	87.50 92.50 185.00 740.00 555.00	175.00 87.50 675.00 185.00	450.00 647.50 277.50 1,305.00 1,215.00 525.00	Total

Odoc 1.	11 00 00	)330 L	ים ו	ocum	CHIL U.	<b>5</b> 1	•	iicc	1 00/	2011	20	i age	J 11 C	11 54			
07/27/2017 08/03/2017 08/04/2017 08/06/2017	07/27/2017	07/24/2017	07/24/2017	07/24/2017	07/24/2017	07/12/2017	07/10/2017	07/07/2017	06/08/2017	06/05/2017	06/05/2017	06/05/2017	06/02/2017	05/12/2017	04/20/2017	04/19/2017	Date
E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox R. Henneke	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox			Y. Simental	Y. Simental	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	Staff
Same potential case research - intervention and draft intervention  Research and draft intervention response  Draft intervention response  Review draft Response to Motion to Intervene		- =	Conference with T. Hadzi-Antich regarding response to Defendant-Intervenors' Motion to Intervene	Review email from Defendant-Intervenors regarding proposed Motion to Intervene	Review of proposed intervenors draft motion to intervene which was sent to us as a courtesy	GCW PIA request response draft	Further attention to summons to local U.S. attorney	Attention to service documents to local U.S. attorney	Request issuance of summons and contact process server for service	Finalize Complaint and file with court	Email client regarding filing of lawsuit	Revise Complaint, prepare lawsuit for filing, Review and proofread pleadings and approve to file	Telephone conference with GLO regarding litigation strategy and preparation for filing lawsuit	Email exchange with WH CEQ Mario Loyola regarding NEPA issue raised in GCW 60-day NOI letter	Email draft Complaint to Client with status update	Review draft Complaint	Task
0.75 3.50 1.50 0.50	0.50	0.25	0.50	0.50	1.50	2.00	0.30	0.30	0.75	1.00	0.25	2.50	0.50	0.50	0.25	1.00	Time
185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 350 \$	185 \$	350 \$	350 \$	350 \$	450 \$	185 \$		450 \$	75 \$	75 \$	350 \$		350 \$	350 \$	350 \$	350 <b>\$</b>	
138.75 647.50 277.50 175.00	92.50	87.50	175.00	175.00	675.00	370.00	135.00	135.00	56.25	75.00	87.50	875.00	175.00	175.00	87.50	350.00	Total

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 12 of 34
-----------------------	---------------	----------------	---------------

09/25/2017	09/21/2017 09/21/2017	09/21/2017	09/21/2017	09/20/2017	09/20/2017	09/20/2017		09/18/2017	09/07/2017	00/07/00/7	08/25/2017	08/25/2017		08/21/2017		08/16/2017	08/15/2017	08/08/2017		08/08/2017			08/08/2017	08/07/2017	08/06/2017	Date
R. Henneke	Y. Simental Y. Simental	•	E. Wilcox	•	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich		T Hadzi-Antich	T. Henneke		R. Henneke	R. Henneke		Y. Simental		Y. Simental	Y. Simental	Y. Simental		R. Henneke			E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke	Staff
Review, edit and approve response to DOJ Motion to Dismiss	to Dismiss Finalize and file Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint	Research & draft opposition to motion for extension  Finalize and file Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion	Proofread response to MTD and amended complaint	Revise draft response to DOJ's Motion to Dismiss	Attention to drafting amendments to complaint		Finalized first draft of our repose to the Warbler Motion to	Further attention to response to motion to dismiss	Attention to repose to metion to dismiss	Conference with Reed Wilson at PERC regarding potential	Review Defendant Intervenors' Reply to Motion to Intervene	status of Motion to Continue Tuesday's hearing	Telephone conference with Court Chambers regarding	Intervene	Download, circulate and calendar Order Setting Motion to	Finalize and file Appearance of Counsel for E. Wilcox	Draft Appearance of Counsel for E. Wilcox	Intervene and file with court	Finalize Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion to	Time	regarding Proposed Intervenors' Request for Additional	Email exchange with T. Hadzi-Antich and E. Wilcox	Edits to intervention response	Edits to intervention response	Email exchange with T. Hadzi-Antich and E. Wilcox regarding Response to Motion to Intervene	Task
1.00	1.00 0.50	1.00	0.50	0.50 0.35	2.00	4.00		7 30	7.60	2	0.50	0.25		0.25		0.50	0.50	1.00		0.25			0.50	0.75	0.25	Time
350 \$	75 \$ 75 \$		185 <b>\$</b>						350 <del>0</del>		350 \$	350 \$		75 \$		75 \$		75 \$		350 \$				185 \$		Rate
350.00	75.00 37.50	185.00	92.50	175.00 87 E0	900.00	1,800.00	0,100	3 285 00	3 430 00	0	175.00	87.50		18.75		37.50	37.50	75.00		87.50			92.50	138.75	87.50	Total

10/16/2017	10/16/2017	10/12/2017	10/12/2017	10/12/2017	10/12/2017	10/12/2017	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	10/11/2017	10/10/2017	10/10/2017	10/09/2017		10/09/2017	10/05/2017		10/03/2017	10/02/2017		09/29/2017	09/29/2017		09/25/2017	Date
E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich	-		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich		E. Wilcox	R. Henneke		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		R. Henneke	Staff
complaint, motion for leave to file, and proposed order	Attention to finalizing four documents for client review:  Response, Motion, Complaint, Proposed Order  Edits and proof response to 2nd MTD, 2nd amended	amended complaint, motion for leave to file	Edits to response to 2nd MTD, 2nd amended complaint	Correspondence with government counsel regarding second amended complaint	Attention for motion for leave to file 2nd amended complaint	Further attention to Response to 2nd MTD	Further attention to Response to Second MTD	Review defendant-intervenors' proposed Answer	Draft 2nd Amended Complaint and motion for leave to file	Edits and response to 2nd MTD	Response to 2nd MTD	Attention to Second Amended Complaint	dismiss	Distinguishing cases in the government's second motion to	Response to 2nd MTD	litigation strategy	Briefing with Client GLO A. Idsal on status of litigation,	Email information to THA	and notice of late filing	Research and draft opposition to motion to file out of time	Research history of 50 CFR 424.14	time	Research & draft potential opposition to reply filed out of	meeting	Task
2.00	6.30	0.75	1.50	0.50	1.00	4.20	1.30	7C O	2.25	3.50	3.75	2.00	3.70		4.50	1.25		0.25	2.75		0.25	0.50		0.25	Time
185 \$	450 \$	185 \$	185 \$	450 \$	450 \$		450 \$		185 \$	185 \$	185 \$				185 \$	350 \$		185 \$	185 \$		185 \$	185 \$		350 \$	Rate
370.00	2,835.00	138.75	277.50	225.00	450.00	1,890.00	585.00	87 50	416.25	647.50	693.75	900.00	1,665.00		832.50	437.50		46.25	508.75		46.25	92.50		87.50	Total

10/23/2017 T.	10/23/2017 T.	10/20/2017 T.	10/20/2017 R. 10/20/2017 R.	10/19/2017 E. 10/20/2017 Y.	10/19/2017 R.	10/19/2017 Y.	10/19/2017 Y.	10/18/2017 Y.	10/18/2017 T.	10/16/2017 T. 10/17/2017 T.		10/16/2017 R.	10/16/2017 R.	Date Staff
T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich	R. Henneke R. Henneke	E. Wilcox Y. Simental	R. Henneke	Y. Simental	Y. Simental	Y. Simental	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	aff
presentation	Attention to travel plans to Austin for warpler nearing and moot courts  Attention to travel plans to Austin for warpler nearing and	Attention to details regarding setting up moot courts for the Warbler Hearing on the MTD	Review Court's Order granting leave to file 2nd A Complaint Discuss case status, next steps in light of Court's Order	for THA related to Judge Sparks procedures Finalize and file Second Amended Complaint		Finalize and file Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Leave to File 2nd Amended Complaint			_	Response, Motion, Complaint, Proposed Order Final touches on the fourth Warbler documents for filing	complaint, motion for leave to file, and proposed order Attention to finalizing four documents for client review:	Review and revise draft Response to MTD, Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint, and 2nd Amended Complaint Fdits and proof response to 2nd MTD, 2nd amended	Conterence with THA regarding strategy for responding to DOJ MTD	Task
4.30	1.40	5.70	0.25 0.25	1.50 0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.50	6.30 1.80	2.00	1.75	0.50	Time
450 \$	450 \$	450 \$	350 \$ 350 \$	185 \$ 75 \$	350 \$	75 \$	75 \$	75 \$	450 \$	450 \$ 450 \$	185 \$	350 \$	350 \$	Rate
1,935.00	630.00	2,565.00	87.50 87.50	277.50 37.50	175.00	37.50	37.50	18.75	225.00	2,835.00 810.00	370.00	612.50	175.00	Total

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 15 of 34
-----------------------	---------------	----------------	---------------

11/03/2017	11/03/2017	11/01/2017	11/01/2017	11/01/2017	11/01/2017		11/01/2017		11/01/2017		10/31/2017	10/31/2017	10/31/2017	10/31/2017	10/30/2017		10/30/2017		10/30/2017	10/27/2017		10/25/2017		10/24/2017	10/23/2017	10/23/2017	Date
T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox	п. Wilcox		R. Henneke	T. Hadzi-Antich		T. Hadzi-Antich		T. Hadzi-Antich		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich		T. Hadzi-Antich		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	Staff
Attention to draft response in connection with statute of limitations issue on Claim 1	Response to Motion to Dismiss	Response to Motion to Dismiss	Call with THA regarding response to Motion to Dismiss	Review DOJ 2nd MTD	Judge Spark's chambers	Attention to scheduling issues with Devon Flannagan and	to respond	Attention to government's third motion to dismiss and begin	moot courts	Attention to travel plans to Austin for Warbler hearing and	Draft additional questions	Answers to judge's questions	Edits to oral arguments	Further prep for hearing on MTD claims 1 and 3	and 3	Attention to prep for hearing on motion to dismiss claims 1	issues	Attention to prep for hearing regarding the intervention	Draft oral argument for and against MTD	outline	Additional research and edits to THA's MTD argument	intervene, list of potential questions from judge	intervene and intervenor's oral argument on motion to	Draft opposition argument for MTD and Motion to Intervene	MTD	Intervene hearing preparation  Output  District of the property of the propert	Task
6.30	3.75	6.00 4 50	1.50	0.75	0.70		2.00		1.00		1.00	2.00	2.00	2.10	5.20		2.30		4.00	3.50		5.25		5.00	3.00	0.75	Time
450 \$	185 \$		185 \$				450 \$		450 \$		185 \$		185 \$	450 \$			450 \$		185 \$	185 \$		185 \$		185 \$	185 \$	185 \$	Rate
2,835.00	693.75	1,110.00 832 50	277.50	262.50	315.00		900.00		450.00		185.00	370.00	370.00	945.00	2,340.00		1,035.00		740.00	647.50		971.25		925.00	555.00	138.75	Total

	11/04/2017 11/06/2017 11/06/2017 11/06/2017 11/07/2017 11/07/2017 11/09/2017 11/09/2017 11/10/2017 11/10/2017 11/10/2017 11/11/2017 11/11/2017 11/11/2017	11/13/2017 11/13/2017 11/14/2017 11/14/2017 11/14/2017 11/14/2017	111	11/ //		11/	11/ 11/	11/:	11/		11/	11/:	11/-		11/(	11/(	11/(	11/(	11/(		11/(	11/(	11/(		11/(	11/(	Date	
T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich R. Henneke E. Wilcox E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox R. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox T. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox R. Walters		Finalize Warbier response to third MTD	Case research for Motion to Dismiss oral argument	r and participate in moot court	Prepare for and participate in moot court  Prepare for and participate in mo Warbler moot court	Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss	Worked on Response to the Third Motion to Dismiss  Continued work on Warbler 3 MTD response	Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss	moot court	Prepare opposing counsel argument for Motion to Dismiss	Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss	Prepare for second moot court next week		Made proposal to counsel for government and intervenor	Response to Motion to Dismiss	Prepare for and conduct my first moot court	Response to Motion to Dismiss	Prepare for my first moot court	act in prep for moot courts	Review of cases cited by government regarding failure to	Case research for response to Motion to Dismiss	Case research for response to Motion to Dismiss	to MTD hearing	Confer with THA re: conference with opposing counsel prior			Task  Alletin for Warbler a	
Travel from Sacramento to Austin for Warbler a Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Confer with THA re: conference with opposing of to MTD hearing Wilcox Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Prepare for second moot court next week Wilcox Wilcox Prepare opposing counsel argument for Motion work Wilcox Prepare on Response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare on Response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Worked on Response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Worked on Response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Worked on Response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare for and participate in moot court Walters Walters Walters Walters Prepare for and participate in moot court Walters Walters Walters Prepare for and participate in moot court Walters Walters Prepare for and participate in moot court Walters Walters	Travel from Sacramento to Austin for Warbler and STR moot courts and hearings Final arrangements for outside judges for Warbler Moot courts later this week Confer with THA re: conference with opposing counsel prior to MTD hearing Case research for response to Motion to Dismiss Case research for response to Motion to Dismiss Review of cases cited by government regarding failure to act in prep for moot courts Prepare for my first moot court Response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare for and conduct my first moot court Response to Motion to Dismiss Made proposal to counsel for government and intervenor applicants to simplify the issues at hearing Prepare for second moot court next week Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare opposing counsel argument for Motion to Dismiss Worked on Response to the Third Motion to Dismiss Continued work on Warbler 3 MTD response Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare for and participate in moot court Prepare for and participate in my Warbler moot court Prepare for and participate in my Warbler moot court Moot court Moot court Case research for Motion to Dismiss oral argument	ļ	1.25 2.30	2.00	4.50 5.00	0.75	5.00 5.30	1.50	2.50		2.00	7.30	2.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00		3.50	2.00	0.25		2.60	3.60	Time	
Travel from Sacramento to Austin for Warbler and STR Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Hadzi-Antich Henneke Wilcox Wilcox Review of cases cited by government regarding failure to act in prep for and conduct my first moot court Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Made proposal to counsel for government and intervenor applicants to simplify the issues at hearing Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Prepare opposing counsel argument for Motion to Dismiss Wilcox Prepare opposing counsel to Motion to Dismiss Wilcox	Trask  Tramento to Austin for Warbler and STR I hearings  ants for outside judges for Warbler Moot week  Tre: conference with opposing counsel prior for response to Motion to Dismiss socited by government regarding failure to noot courts first moot court otion to Dismiss conduct my first moot court otion to Dismiss to counsel for government and intervenor mplify the issues at hearing ond moot court next week tresponse to Motion to Dismiss on warbler 3 MTD response tresponse to Motion to Dismiss on Warbler 3 MTD response tresponse to Motion to Dismiss participate in moot court								185 \$		185 \$								450 \$		185 \$				450 \$	450 \$	Rate	
Travel from Sacramento to Austin for Warbler and STR Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox Review and edit response to Motion to Dismiss Hadzi-Antich Wilcox W	Task         Time         Rate           If hearings         3.60         450           ants for outside judges for Warbler Moot         2.60         450           week         2.60         450           A re: conference with opposing counsel prior         0.25         350           for response to Motion to Dismiss         2.00         185           or response to Motion to Dismiss         2.00         185           or response to Motion to Dismiss         3.50         185           or response to Motion to Dismiss         3.00         450           onduct my first moot court         4.00         450           tins to Dismiss         4.00         450           conduct my first moot court         4.00         450           tins to Dismiss         2.00         450           conduct my first moot court         4.00         450           to counsel for government and intervenor         2.00         450           not count next week         7.30         450           t response to Motion to Dismiss         2.50         185           t response to Motion to Dismiss         5.00         450           t response to Motion to Dismiss         5.30         450           t respon		_		1,012.50 2.250.00		2,250.00 2,385.00		462.50			ယ္							1,350.00			W	87.50		1,170.00	1,620.00	Total	

	Case	1:17-	cv-00	538-LY	Docu	ıment	85-1	Filed (	03/20/20	Pa	ıge	17	of	34		
12/01/2017 12/4/2017	12/1/2017	12/1/2017	12/1/2017	11/30/2017 12/01/2017	11/30/2017	11/30/2017	11/30/2017	11/21/2017 11/30/2017	11/16/2017 11/21/2017	11/16/2017	11/16/2017	11/16/2017	11/15/2017	11/15/2017 11/15/2017	11/14/2017	Date
R. Henneke E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	Y. Simental Y. Simental	T. Hadzi-Antich	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	R. Henneke R. Henneke	R. Henneke T. Hadzi-Antich	R. Walters		•	•	I. Hadzi-Antich E. Wilcox	Y. Simental	Staff
	Email to THA with results of interloctory appeal research Confer with EW regarding legal research on interlocutory	Research on interlocutory appeal of order in partial MTD	Callwith THA regarding interlocutory appeal of order in partial MTD	Download and circulate Order Dismissing Motion to Dismiss Dowload, circulate and calendar Scheduling Order	connection with what he said at the hearing	Research on interlocutory appeals under 28 USC s 1291(b)	Attention to Order n Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Intervene	Review DOJ's Reply to 2nd MTD, confer with co-counsel Review Court's dismissal order & confer with counsel	Appearance at hearing on DOJ MTD & D-I Motion for Intervention  Review and analyze government reply	Prepare for and participate in moot court	Research in preparation for Motion to Dismiss hearing	Motion to Dismiss hearing	Research ESA recovery plans	Further prep tor Warbler hearing on MTD claims 1 and 3  Prepare materials for Motion to Dismiss hearing	Finalize and file Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss 2nd Amended Complaint	Task
0.50 1.00	0.25	1.50	0.25	0.25 0.25	4.30	1.00	0.50	0.50 1.00	1.75 2.00	3.00	1.50	2.25	0.75	4.00 0.50	0.75	Time
350 \$ 185 \$	185 \$	185 \$	185 \$	75 <b>\$</b> 75 <b>\$</b>	450 \$	185 \$	185 \$	350 \$ 350 \$	350 \$ 450 \$					450 \$ 185 \$	75 \$	Rate
175.00 185.00	46.25	277.50	46.25	18.75 18.75	1,935.00	185.00	92.50	175.00 350.00	612.50 900.00	675.00	277.50	416.25	138.75	1,800.00 92.50	56.25	Total

Case 1:17-cv-00538-	LY Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 18 of 34	
01/11/2018 01/11/2018 01/14/2018 01/18/2018 01/19/2018 01/19/2018 01/19/2018 01/30/2018 01/30/2018 01/31/2018 01/31/2018	12/20/2017 12/21/2017 01/09/2018 01/10/2018	12/15/2017 12/15/2017 12/19/2017	12/6/2017 12/12/2017 12/12/2017 12/13/2017 12/13/2017 12/14/2017 12/15/2017	Date
E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox F. Wilcox F. Simental F. Simental F. Wilcox F. Wilcox	E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox R. Henneke E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox	Staff
Research on permissibility of expert discovery in APA cases Edits to joint status and scheduling report Review and edit joint status and scheduling report Attention to joint scheduling order and reconciling dates Draft Notice regarding magistrate Create timetable of dates in joint scheduling order Download, circulate and calendar Scheduling Order Attention to Administrative record Research and draft sections for settlement offer	Research and draft memo on en banc hearing and rehearing rules and procedures in 5th Circuit Draft memo to file on THA's initial conversation with Neil Wilkins re: expert witness Research on admissibility of experts; communicate results to THA	Research and draft memo on automatic stay for mot for reconsideration and interlocutory review Telephone conference with THA re next steps, scheduling conference strategy Research and write memo on whether a third amended complaint is needed after partial dismissal	Research hard copy of CEQ guidance on NEPA application to Section 4; e-mail with THA and RH regarding same Attention to Answer to Second Amended Complaint Memo on motion for reconsideration and interlocutory appeal Research 28 USC 1927 Research Count Two remedies Research and draft memo on 28 USC 1927	Task
1.50 0.50 0.75 0.75 0.50 0.50 0.25 0.25 3.00 2.50	3.00 0.25 5.00 3.50	1.50 0.50 1.00	0.50 0.25 2.50 0.50 2.00	Time
185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$	185 \$ 185 \$	185 \$ 350 \$	185 185 4 185 4	Rate
277.50 92.50 138.75 138.75 92.50 92.50 18.75 18.75 555.00 462.50	555.00 46.25 925.00 647.50	277.50 175.00 185.00	92.50 46.25 462.50 92.50 370.00 277.50	Total

Case 1:17-cv-	00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 19 of 34
02/28/2018 02/28/2018 03/01/2018 03/07/2018 03/14/2018	02/27/2018 02/27/2018	02/26/2018 02/26/2018 02/26/2018 02/26/2018	02/22/2018 02/22/2018 02/23/2018	Date 02/06/2018 02/06/2018 02/07/2018 02/08/2018 02/12/2018 02/13/2018 02/13/2018 02/21/2018 02/21/2018
E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox E. Wilcox E. Wilcox R. Walters	E. Wilcox R. Henneke E. Wilcox	Staff  E. Wilcox  E. Wilcox  E. Wilcox  E. Wilcox  E. Wilcox  F. Wilcox  Y. Simental  E. Wilcox  E. Wilcox
Read and summarize scholarly articles missing from AR Emails to non-testifying expert on relevance of certain articles  Communicate w/THA via e-mail regarding status of list of documents missing from AR  Review AR missing docs and discuss w/ THA  Draft and revise Mot. to Supplement AR	Attention to Defendants' edits to proposed joint ADR report Emails with non-testifying expert on missing articles and their relevance	documents missing from AR Investigate documents that should have been included in AR and discuss w/THA how to address them Draft proposed joint ADR report Prepare documents for admission to W.D. Texas	Emails w/non-testifying expert on search for scholarly articles missing from AR Review & revise draft settlement offer, discuss with cocounsel  Draft Itr to DOJ on missing articles from AR	
5.00 0.50 0.25 0.50 2.25	0.25	0.50 1.00 0.50 3.00	0.25 0.50 1.00	Time 1.00 0.25 0.50 0.75 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50
185 \$ 185 \$	185 \$ 185 \$	185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 225 \$	185 \$ 350 \$ 185 \$	185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$ 185 \$
925.00 92.50 46.25 92.50 416.25	46.25 92.50	92.50 185.00 92.50 675.00	46.25 175.00 185.00	Total 185.00 46.25 92.50 138.75 277.50 75.00 277.50 185.00

	Case	e 1:1	7-cv	-005	38	-LY	′ [	Docu	me	nt	85	-1	Fi	led	03	3/20	0/2	0	Pa	ige	20	0	f 34	4				
7/5/2018	7/3/2018 7/3/2018	7/2/2018	05/15/2018	05/15/2018	05/14/2018	05/11/2018	04/27/2018	04/27/2028		04/26/2018		04/26/2018	04/18/2018	04/18/2018	04/18/2018	04/16/2018	04/16/2018	04/13/2018	04/12/2018	04/11/2018	04/05/2018		03/23/2018		03/23/2018	03/15/2018	03/15/2018	Date
T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich	Y. Simental	Y. Simental	Y. Simental	M. Al-Fuhaid	R. Walters	R. Walters		R. Walters		R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	R. Walters	Y. Simental		E. Wilcox		E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	E. Wilcox	Staff
Attention to crafting the argument that failure to designate critical habtitat should be key response		Review and highlight government MSJ Work with R. Walters on strategy to address government		Finalize and file Plaintiff's MSJ	Cite check, revise and format Plaintiff's MSJ	Proofread Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment	Research re: legal standards for review of petitions to delist	record	Review expert's summaries of studies in administrative	record	Review expert's summaries of studies in administrative	Draft statement of facts for MSJ	Draft statement of facts for MSJ	Draft statement of facts for MSJ	Review past filings in case in preparation for MSJ	Organize administrative record for expert	Organize administrative record for expert	Organize administrative record for expert	Research re: rules for filing MSJ	Research re:rules for filing MSJ	of Time to file MSJ	Finalize and file Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Extension	THA	Review DOJ propsal for additional cases, report on same to	Review cases in DOJ ltr on supplementing AR	Draft propsed order and Mot. to Supplement AR	Revise Memo ISO Mot. to Supplement AR	Task
3.7	1.7 4.3	3.2	0.50	1.00	2.00	4.75	6.00	6.00		4.00		3.00	7.00	6.50	6.00	4.00	6.00	7.00	2.25	3.00	0.50		0.75		0.25	0.50	1.00	Time
450 \$	450 \$ 450 \$	450 \$	75 \$	75 \$	75 \$			225 \$		225 \$				225 \$									185 \$			185 \$	O1	Rate
1,665.00	765.00 1,935.00	1,440.00	37.50	75.00	150.00	1,068.75	1,350.00	1,350.00		900.00		675.00	1,575.00	1,462.50	1,350.00	900.00	1,350.00	1,575.00	506.25	675.00	37.50		138.75		46.25	92.50	185.00	Total

Date 7/10/2018 7/11/2018 7/12/2018 7/12/2018 7/16/2018 7/16/2018 7/18/2018	Staff  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich	Teleconft our responder work on issue Review of litigation Attention designed Review same for Comb ad standard Attention wrong standard Further "wrong standard"	Task  Teleconference with R. Walters and M. Morrison regarding our response to government MSJ  Work on response to government MSJ on failure to act issue Review of amicus briefs in suppport of our position in litigation  Attention to work with technical consultant regarding "well designed" Warbler study Review spreadsheet prepared by M. Morrison and edit same for our response to MSJ  Comb administrative record to support our "used the standard" argument  Attention to language regarding the government used the wrong standard in denying the petition  Further attention to our response to government MSJ on the "wrong standard" issue	Task  R. Walters and M. Morrison regarding ernment MSJ 2.1 o government MSJ on failure to act 5.6 iefs in suppport of our position in 2.5 th technical consultant regarding "well study t prepared by M. Morrison and edit se to MSJ are record to support our "used the enying the petition our response to government MSJ on "issue"	Task Time Rate  R. Walters and M. Morrison regarding ernment MSJ o government MSJ on failure to act o government MSJ on failure to act 5.6 450 iefs in suppport of our position in 2.5 450 th technical consultant regarding "well study t prepared by M. Morrison and edit se to MSJ record to support our "used the e regarding the government used the enying the petition our response to government MSJ on "issue"
18 18	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich	litigation Attention to work with technical of designed Warbler study	consultant regarding "well		2.5 3.7
/16/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	same for our response to MSJ Comb administrative record to s	support our "used the		2.7 450
7/16/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	standard" argument Attention to language regarding	y the government used the	d the	3 450 d the
7/18/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	wrong standard in denying the petition Further attention to our response to go	petition se to government MSJ on	overnment MSJ on	overnment MSJ on 5.7 450
7/19/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	the "wrong standard" issue Further work on Warbler response to governmen	onse to government MSJ and	3.8 and 3.8	nt MSJ and
7/20/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	incorporation of M. Morrison's suggestions Attention to tuning all arguments in the brief in	a	a	anticipation
7/23/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	of final push Recraft entire brief to tighten arguments and meet word	arguments and meet word	6.5 arguments and meet word	
7/24/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	count Further work on brief after R.	count Further work on brief after R. Walters incorporated material	7.2 Walters incorporated material	erial
7/25/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	from M. Morrison  Further work fine-tuning the brief for word count	brief for word count and	6.7 brief for word count and	and
7/26/2018 7/27/2018	<ul><li>T. Hadzi-Antich</li><li>T. Hadzi-Antich</li></ul>	persusaiveness Further work on brief in final push	push	7.6 8	
7/29/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	Work on finalizing brief Revise brief in response to comments received	comments received from clients	from clients 7	7.4 450 from clients
7/30/2018 7/30/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich	and others Attention to M. Morrison invoice	oice	1.7 Dice 0.2	
7/31/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	Final review of brief before authorizing Y. Simen	uthorizing Y. Simental to file	uthorizing Y. Simental to file 1	uthorizing Y. Simental to file 1 450 \$

	Date	Staff	Task	Time	Rate	Total
	7/31/2018	Y. Simental	Finalize and file Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Cross MSJ and Reply	1.5		112.50
	8/15/2018	T. Hadzi-Antich	Review of government's reply brief	2.1	450 \$	945.00
	2/6/2019	Y. Simental	Final Judgment	0.25	75 \$	18.75
	2/6/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Read Warbler opinion and send to client	1.2	450 \$	540.00
5	2/6/2019	R. Walters	Review order denying our MSJ and granting FWS's MSJ	1.25	225 \$	281.25
			Prepare for and participate in conference call with clients			
	2/7/2019	R. Walters	and R. Henneke regarding appeal strategy  Attention to review of options for notice of appeal to 6th Cir.	2	225 \$	450.00
	2/12/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich		5.7	450 \$	2,565.00
	2/13/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Further attention to scope of appeal to 5th Cir.	6.3	450 \$	2,835.00
			Further attention to case law to determine whether claims 1			
	2/14/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	and 3 should be appealed	2.7		1,215.00
	2/21/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Attention to which claims to appeal to 5th Cir.	3.2		1,440.00
	2/25/2019	R. Walters	Draft Notice of Appeal	_	225 \$	225.00
	2/26/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Notice of appeal to 5th Cir.	1.9		855.00
	2/26/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Review of key parts of administrative record for appeal	5.7	450 \$	2,565.00
	3/1/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Finalize and file notice of appeal	3.4		1,530.00
	3/1/2019	Y. Simental	Draft, finazlie and file Notice of Appeal	2		150.00
	3/7/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Notice of Appearance filed	0.2	450 \$	90.00
	3/8/2019	Y. Simental	~	_	75 \$	75.00
	3/11/2019	Y. Simental	and T. Hadzi-Antich	_	75 \$	75.00
	3/12/2019	Y. Simental	Draft, finalze and file Notice of Appearance for R. Walters	0.5	75 \$	37.50
	3/12/2019		Research assignment for C. Applegate	1.2		540.00
	3/13/2019		Review of transcript if hearing before Judge Sparks	ე კ. ნ	450 \$	1,620.00
	3/13/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Further work with C. Appleagte on her assignment	0.5	450 <del>\$</del>	37.50 315.00
				,		

'	Date 3/14/2019 3/14/2019 3/19/2019 3/20/2019	Staff  T. Hadzi-Antich  T. Hadzi-Antich  R. Walters  R. Walters	Task  script of hearing before uments to R. Walters or th Cir. garding administrative	1.3 1.4 2.25 5.75	450 \$ 450 \$ 225 \$
	3/20/2019	R. Walters  T. Hadzi-Antich	review record in case Read Yeakel's opinion in BCH case and found good language for Warbler	0.7	450
	4/1/2019	•	Draft Opening Brief in 5th Cir.	4.75	
	4/2/2019	R. Walters	Draft Opening Brief in 5th Cir.	ω	N
	4/3/2019	•		ω	225
	4/4/2019	•	5th	2.5	N
	4/4/2019		5th	2.3	450 335
	4/5/2019 4/8/2019	R. Walters	Draft Opening Brief in 5th Cir.  Draft Opening Brief in 5th Cir.	U 4	v v
	4/9/2019	•		2.25	225
	4/10/2019	R. Walters	Draft Opening Brief in 5th Cir.	2	225
	4/11/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	Attention to drafting brief regarding claim 3 NEPA issues	7.7	450
	4/12/2019 4/15/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich	Further attention to claim 3 issues in opening brief Attention to argument on claim 2 issues in opening brief	6.7 8.5	450 450
	4/15/2019	R Walters	Sth Cir	7	225
	4/16/2019	R. Walters	Revise draft opening brief Further attention to claim 2 issues and record cites	4	225
	4/16/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	regarding same in opening brief Further attention to claim 2 issues in Warbler and edit entire	9.7	450
	4/17/2019	T. Hadzi-Antich	brief for persuasivness  Review T. Hadzi-Antich's revised draft of opening brief in	7.5	450
	4/17/2019	R. Walters	5th Cir.	υ N	225
	4/18/2019	R. Walters	Revise draft opening brief	ω	N

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 24 of 34
-----------------------	---------------	----------------	---------------

	Case 1:1	.7-cv-00	0538-LY	Docum	ent 85-1	Filed 03/2	20/20 F	Page 24 of	f 34	
7/1/2019	6/26/2019 6/27/2019 6/28/2019	6/24/2019	4/26/2019 4/29/2019 4/30/2019 6/21/2019	4/22/2019 4/22/2019	4/20/2019 4/22/2019	4/19/2019 4/20/2019	4/19/2019	4/19/2019 4/19/2019 4/19/2019	4/18/2019 4/18/2019 4/18/2019 4/18/2019	
T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich		R. Walters R. Walters R. Walters R. Henneke	Y. Simental Y. Simental		R. Walters R. Walters	T. Hadzi-Antich	Y. Simental Y. Simental T. Hadzi-Antich	T. Hadzi-Antich R. Henneke Y. Simental Y. Simental	Stoff
Attention to reply in Warbler case, concentrating on statute of limitations issues for failure to designate critical habitat	Continue review of FWS Response Brief Continue review of FWS Response Brief Finish review of FWS Response Brief	Begin review of FWS Response Brief Continue review of FWS Response Brief	Review of articus briefs filed in warbier case Review amicus briefs filed in support of GLO Review DOJ Appellee Brief	Finalize and file Appellant's Brief  Finalize and file Record Excerpts	Full "fresh look" at entire brief and EOR; Attention to jots and titles  Final approval for brief to file  Final region of proping brief in Eth Circ before filing	brief in 5th Cir.  Review citations and excerpts of record in draft opening brief in 5th Cir.  Brief in 5th Cir.  Brief in 5th Cir.	Multiple emails and phone conversations with Y. Simental and R. Walters to finalize opening brief	Cite check, revise and format Apellant's Brief Gather and prepare documents for Record Excerpts Review cite check draft, make adjustments as necessary	Incorporate client comments into opening brief and review entire brief for consistency Revise Appellant's Brief Cite check, revise and format Apellant's Brief Gather and prepare documents for Record Excerpts	Tack
6.7	7.5 7.4 7.8	7.8 6.7	3.25 3.25 1.25	1.5 0.5	7.9 2.3	3.5 2	2.8	ა ა აათ	5.7 4.5 6	H H H
450 \$	450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$		225 \$ 350 \$			225 \$ 225 \$		75 \$ 75 \$	450 \$ 350 \$ 75 \$ 75 \$	Dato
3,015.00	3,375.00 3,330.00 3,510.00	3,510.00 3,015.00	1,440.00 731.25 675.00 437.50	112.50 37.50	3,555.00 1,035.00	450.00 787.50	1,260.00	375.00 225.00	2,565.00 1,575.00 450.00 150.00	T0+3

Case 1:17-	CV-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20	Page 25 of 34	
7/15/2019 7/16/2019 7/16/2019 7/17/2019	7/12/2019 7/13/2019 7/14/2019 7/15/2019	7/10/2019 7/11/2019 7/11/2019 7/12/2019	7/8/2019 7/8/2019 7/9/2019 7/9/2019 7/10/2019	7/2/2019 7/3/2019 7/3/2019 7/4/2019 7/5/2019	<b>Date</b> 7/1/2019 7/2/2019
T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich Y. Simental Y. Simental	T. Hadzi-Antich R. Walters R. Walters R. Walters	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich R. Walters R. Walters	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich R. Walters R. Walters		Staff R. Walters R. Walters
Further attention to claim 2 for reply brief regarding details of impermissibly pitting studies against each other Bring arguments of the three claims into a coordinated whole for Reply Brief Cite check, revise and format Reply Brief Cite check, revise and format Reply Brief	against each other for Reply brief  Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.  Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.  Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.	Attention to claim 2 issues of FWS using the wrong standard during 90 day review for Reply Work with outside technical consultant on various studies for support of claim 2 argument in Reply Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.  Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.  Further attention to how FWS impermissibly pitted studies	Attention to statute of limitations for NEPA for Reply Further attention to statute of limitations issues for NEPA for Reply Draft reply brief in 5th Cir. Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.	Further attention to statute of limitations issue for reply regarding designation of critical habitat Further attention to statute of limitations issue for reply regarding designation of critical habitat Draft reply brief in 5th Cir. Draft reply brief in 5th Cir. Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.	<b>Task</b> Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.  Draft reply brief in 5th Cir.
& 9 5 6 3 5	8.4 3.25 4.5	8.7 7.2 2.25 3	4.5.3 4.5.3	8.3 8.7 3.25 3.5	<b>Time</b> 4.75 5
450 \$ 450 \$ 75 \$	450 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$	450 \$ 450 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$	450 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$	450 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$	<b>Rate</b> 225 \$ 225 \$
4,275.00 3,735.00 450.00 375.00	3,780.00 731.25 1,012.50 900.00	3,915.00 3,240.00 506.25 675.00	4,230.00 4,230.00 2,385.00 1,012.50 675.00	3,735.00 3,915.00 675.00 731.25 787.50	<b>Total</b> 1,068.75 1,125.00

Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY	Document 85-1	Filed 03/20/20 Page 26 of 34	
11/12/2019 11/12/2019 11/13/2019 11/14/2019 11/14/2019 11/20/2019 11/20/2019 11/21/2019 11/26/2019 12/2/2019	11/7/2019 11/8/2019 11/11/2019 11/11/2019 11/12/2019 11/12/2019 11/12/2019	7/17/2019 7/17/2019 7/17/2019 7/18/2019 7/18/2019 9/20/2019 10/24/2019 10/28/2019 10/28/2019	Date
T. Hadzi-Antich A. Barnes R. Henneke	T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich T. Hadzi-Antich M. Al-Fuhaid M. Al-Fuhaid A. Barnes		Staff
Attention to outline for oral argument Further work on preparation for oral argument Prepare for second moot court Moot court with R. Walters in preparation for 5th Cir. oral argument in December Review of law professors' amicus brief Prepare questions for R. Walters to prep him for oral Further attention to preparing tough questions for R. Research on previous decisions by Judges on the Panel Meeting with R. Walters to prepare for oral argument	judge in moot court Submit revised oral argument form to 5th Cir. Further preparation for moot court Read appellate briefs in preparation for moot court Read appellate briefs in preparation for moot court Attend Warbler moot court Further preparation for moot court and participation as	aking sure all FWS po aking sure all FWS po th Cir.  ply Brief it of reply brief notice regarding oral and calendar Court's ment ary preparation for W ary preparation for W s for Warbler moot co nents for Warbler oral	Task  Firsther work on various geneats of really brief including the
4.5 4.3 7.5 1 1	2.0.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	9.7 5.25 1.5 1.5 0.25 0.25 1.7 1.5	Time
450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 450 \$ 350 \$	450 \$ 450 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$		Rate

2,160.00 225.00 2,835.00 225.00 450.00 562.50

540.00 765.00 675.00

18.75

450.00 1,395.00 2,385.00 3,375.00 450.00

350.00

765.00 1,935.00

2,025.00 1,665.00 Total

4,365.00 1,181.25 525.00 75.00 1,530.00 315.00

	1/15/2020	1/15/2020	1/15/2020	12/4/2019	12/4/2019	12/4/2019	12/4/2019	12/3/2019	12/3/2019	12/3/2019	Date
	K. Henneke Y. Simental	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	T. Hadzi-Antich	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	R. Henneke	Staff
	Email client regarding 5th Cir. Opinion  Download and circulate Opinion	Confer with co-counsel regarding 5th Cir. opinion	Review 5th Cir. Opinion	Listen to oral argument of Warbler in 5th Cir.	Return travel from New Orleans	Post argument meeting with clients and counsel	Appearance at 5th Cir. argument	Practice argument at 5th Cir.	Prepare for oral argument	Travel to New Orleans for oral argument	Task
1153.65	0.25	0.5	0.75	_	5	2	2	_	ω	4	Time
↔	350 75 \$	350 \$								350 \$	Rate
\$ 372,733.75	87.50 18.75	175.00	262.50	450.00	1,750.00	700.00	700.00	350.00	1,050.00	1,400.00	Total

# EXHIBIT B

### USAO ATTORNEY'S FEES MATRIX — 2015-2019

Revised Methodology starting with 2015-2016 Year

Years (Hourly Rate for June 1 – May 31, based on change in PPI-OL since January 2011)

Experience	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
31+ years	568	581	602	613
21-30 years	530	543	563	572
16-20 years	504	516	536	544
11-15 years	455	465	483	491
8-10 years	386	395	410	417
6-7 years	332	339	352	358
4-5 years	325	332	346	351
2-3 years	315	322	334	340
Less than 2 years	284	291	302	307
Paralegals & Law Clerks	154	157	164	166

### Explanatory Notes

- 1. This matrix of hourly rates for attorneys of varying experience levels and paralegals/law clerks has been prepared by the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO) to evaluate requests for attorney's fees in civil cases in District of Columbia courts. The matrix is intended for use in cases in which a feeshifting statute permits the prevailing party to recover "reasonable" attorney's fees. *See*, *e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(k) (Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act); 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E) (Freedom of Information Act); 28 U.S.C. § 2412(b) (Equal Access to Justice Act). The matrix has not been adopted by the Department of Justice generally for use outside the District of Columbia, or by other Department of Justice components, or in other kinds of cases. The matrix does **not** apply to cases in which the hourly rate is limited by statute. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d).
- 2. A "reasonable fee" is a fee that is sufficient to attract an adequate supply of capable counsel for meritorious cases. *See, e.g., Perdue v. Kenny A. ex rel. Winn*, 559 U.S. 542, 552 (2010). Consistent with that definition, the hourly rates in the above matrix were calculated from average hourly rates reported in 2011 survey data for the D.C. metropolitan area, which rates were adjusted for inflation with the Producer Price Index-Office of Lawyers (PPI-OL) index. The survey data comes from ALM Legal Intelligence's 2010 & 2011 Survey of Law Firm Economics. The PPI-OL index is available at <a href="http://www.bls.gov/ppi">http://www.bls.gov/ppi</a>. On that page, under "PPI Databases," and "Industry Data (Producer Price Index PPI)," select either "one screen" or "multi-screen" and in the resulting window use "industry code" 541110 for "Offices of Lawyers" and "product code" 541110541110 for "Offices of Lawyers." The average hourly rates from the 2011 survey data are multiplied by the PPI-OL index for May in the year of the update, divided by 176.6, which is the PPI-OL index for January 2011, the month of the survey data, and then rounding to the nearest whole dollar (up if remainder is 50¢ or more).
- 3. The PPI-OL index has been adopted as the inflator for hourly rates because it better reflects the mix of legal services that law firms collectively offer, as opposed to the legal services that typical consumers use, which is what the CPI-

Legal Services index measures. Although it is a national index, and not a local one, *cf. Eley v. District of Columbia*, 793 F.3d 97, 102 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (noting criticism of national inflation index), the PPI-OL index has historically been generous relative to other possibly applicable inflation indexes, and so its use should minimize disputes about whether the inflator is sufficient.

- 4. The methodology used to compute the rates in this matrix replaces that used prior to 2015, which started with the matrix of hourly rates developed in *Laffey v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.* 572 F. Supp. 354 (D.D.C. 1983), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part on other grounds*, 746 F.2d 4 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 472 U.S. 1021 (1985), and then adjusted those rates based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for the Washington-Baltimore (DC-MD-VA-WV) area. Because the USAO rates for the years 2014-15 and earlier have been generally accepted as reasonable by courts in the District of Columbia, *see* note 9 below, the USAO rates for those years will remain the same as previously published on the USAO's public website. That is, the USAO rates for years prior to and including 2014-15 remain based on the prior methodology, *i.e.*, the original *Laffey* Matrix updated by the CPI-U for the Washington-Baltimore area. *See Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Washington v. Dep't of Justice*, 142 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2015) and Declaration of Dr. Laura A. Malowane filed therein on Sept. 22, 2015 (Civ. Action No. 12-1491, ECF No. 46-1) (confirming that the USAO rates for 2014-15 computed using prior methodology are reasonable).
- 5. Although the USAO will not issue recalculated *Laffey* Matrices for past years using the new methodology, it will not oppose the use of that methodology (if properly applied) to calculate reasonable attorney's fees under applicable feeshifting statutes for periods prior to June 2015, provided that methodology is used consistently to calculate the entire fee amount. Similarly, although the USAO will no longer issue an updated *Laffey* Matrix computed using the prior methodology, it will not oppose the use of the prior methodology (if properly applied) to calculate reasonable attorney's fees under applicable fee-shifting statutes for periods after May 2015, provided that methodology is used consistently to calculate the entire fee amount.
- 6. The various "brackets" in the column headed "Experience" refer to the attorney's years of experience practicing law. Normally, an attorney's experience will be calculated starting from the attorney's graduation from law school. Thus, the "Less than 2 years" bracket is generally applicable to attorneys in their first and second years after graduation from law school, and the "2-3 years" bracket generally becomes applicable on the second anniversary of the attorney's graduation (*i.e.*, at the beginning of the third year following law school). See Laffey, 572 F. Supp. at 371. An adjustment may be necessary, however, if the attorney's admission to the bar was significantly delayed or the attorney did not otherwise follow a typical career progression. See, e.g., EPIC v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 999 F. Supp. 2d 61, 70-71 (D.D.C. 2013) (attorney not admitted to bar compensated at "Paralegals & Law Clerks" rate); EPIC v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 982 F. Supp. 2d 56, 60-61 (D.D.C. 2013) (same). The various experience levels were selected by relying on the levels in the ALM Legal Intelligence 2011 survey data. Although finer gradations in experience level might yield different estimates of market rates, it is important to have statistically sufficient sample sizes for each experience level. The experience categories in the current USAO Matrix are based on statistically significant sample sizes for each experience level.
- 7. ALM Legal Intelligence's 2011 survey data does not include rates for paralegals and law clerks. Unless and until reliable survey data about actual paralegal/law clerk rates in the D.C. metropolitan area become available, the USAO will compute the hourly rate for Paralegals & Law Clerks using the most recent historical rate from the USAO's former *Laffey* Matrix (*i.e.*, \$150 for 2014-15) updated with the PPI-OL index. The formula is \$150 multiplied by the PPI-OL index for May in the year of the update, divided by 194.3 (the PPI-OL index for May 2014), and then rounding to the nearest whole dollar (up if remainder is 50¢ or more).
- 8. The USAO anticipates periodically revising the above matrix if more recent reliable survey data becomes available, especially data specific to the D.C. market, and in the interim years updating the most recent survey data with the PPI-OL index, or a comparable index for the District of Columbia if such a locality-specific index becomes available.
- 9. Use of an updated *Laffey* Matrix was implicitly endorsed by the Court of Appeals in *Save Our Cumberland Mountains v. Hodel*, 857 F.2d 1516, 1525 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (en banc). The Court of Appeals subsequently stated that parties may rely on the updated *Laffey* Matrix prepared by the USAO as evidence of prevailing market rates for litigation counsel in the Washington, D.C. area. *See Covington v. District of Columbia*, 57 F.3d 1101, 1105 & n.14, 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1995), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1115 (1996). Most lower federal courts in the District of Columbia

have relied on the USAO's Laffey Matrix, rather than the so-called "Salazar Matrix" (also known as the "LSI Matrix" or the "Enhanced Laffey Matrix"), as the "benchmark for reasonable fees" in this jurisdiction. Miller v. Holzmann, 575 F. Supp. 2d 2, 18 n.29 (D.D.C. 2008) (quoting Pleasants v. Ridge, 424 F. Supp. 2d 67, 71 n.2 (D.D.C. 2006)); see, e.g., Joaquin v. Friendship Pub. Charter Sch., 188 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2016); Prunty v. Vivendi, 195 F. Supp. 3d 107 (D.D.C. 2016); CREW v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 142 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2015); McAllister v. District of Columbia, 21 F. Supp. 3d 94 (D.D.C. 2014); Embassy of Fed. Republic of Nigeria v. Ugwuonye, 297 F.R.D. 4, 15 (D.D.C. 2013); Berke v. Bureau of Prisons, 942 F. Supp. 2d 71, 77 (D.D.C. 2013); Fisher v. Friendship Pub. Charter Sch., 880 F. Supp. 2d 149, 154-55 (D.D.C. 2012); Sykes v. District of Columbia, 870 F. Supp. 2d 86, 93-96 (D.D.C. 2012); Heller v. District of Columbia, 832 F. Supp. 2d 32, 40-49 (D.D.C. 2011); Hayes v. D.C. Public Schools, 815 F. Supp. 2d 134, 142-43 (D.D.C. 2011); Queen Anne's Conservation Ass'n v. Dep't of State, 800 F. Supp. 2d 195, 200-01 (D.D.C. 2011); Woodland v. Viacom, Inc., 255 F.R.D. 278, 279-80 (D.D.C. 2008); American Lands Alliance v. Norton, 525 F. Supp. 2d 135, 148-50 (D.D.C. 2007). But see, e.g., Salazar v. District of Columbia, 123 F. Supp. 2d 8, 13-15 (D.D.C. 2000). Since initial publication of the instant USAO Matrix in 2015, numerous courts similarly have employed the USAO Matrix rather than the Salazar Matrix for fees incurred since 2015. E.g., Electronic Privacy Information Center v. United States Drug Enforcement Agency, 266 F. Supp. 3d 162, 171 (D.D.C. 2017) ("After examining the case law and the supporting evidence offered by both parties, the Court is persuaded that the updated USAO matrix, which covers billing rates from 2015 to 2017, is the most suitable choice here.") (requiring recalculation of fees that applicant had computed according to Salazar Matrix); Clemente v. FBI, No. 08-1252 (BJR) (D.D.C. Mar. 24, 2017), 2017 WL 3669617, at \*5 (applying USAO Matrix, as it is "based on much more current data than the Salazar Matrix"); Gatore v. United States Dep't of Homeland Security, 286 F. Supp. 3d 25, 37 (D.D.C. 2017) (although plaintiff had submitted a "great deal of evidence regarding [the] prevailing market rates for complex federal litigation' to demonstrate that its requested [Salazar] rates are entitled to a presumption of reasonableness, . . . the Court nonetheless concludes that the defendant has rebutted that presumption and shown that the current USAO Matrix is the more accurate matrix for estimating the prevailing rates for complex federal litigation in this District"); DL v. District of Columbia, 267 F. Supp. 3d 55, 70 (D.D.C. 2017) ("the USAO Matrix ha[s] more indicia of reliability and more accurately represents prevailing market rates" than the Salazar Matrix). The USAO contends that the Salazar Matrix is fundamentally flawed, does not use the Salazar Matrix to determine whether fee awards under fee-shifting statutes are reasonable, and will not consent to pay hourly rates calculated with the methodology on which that matrix is based. The United States recently submitted an appellate brief that further explains the reliability of the USAO Matrix vis-à-vis the Salazar matrix. See Br. for the United States as Amicus Curiae Supporting Appellees, DL v. District of Columbia, No. 18-7004 (D.C. Cir. filed July 20, 2018).

# EXHIBIT C

# EXPENSES - GLO v. USFWS, ET AL.

Date	Description:	Amount
5/15/2017	Clerk, U.S. District Court - Filing Fee Pro Hac Vice Motion for T. Hadzi-Antich	100.00
6/5/2017	Pay.gov - Filing fee for Org. Complaint U.S. Dist. Court for Western Dist.	400.00
6/13/2017	Postage - CMRRR 5 packages	94.95
6/19/2017	Postage - CMRRR	17.75
7/12/2017	Postage - CMRRR	13.90
12/4/2017	Lily Reznik - Court Reporter Transcript of Motion Hearing on 11/16/17	152.60
2/19/2018	Postage - CMRRR	4.87
3/2/2018	Michael Morrison - Expert Fees	2581.32
4/30/2018	Michael Morrison - Expert Fees	1740.00
7/31/2018	Michael Morrison - Expert Fees	1680.00
3/1/2019	Pay.gov- Filing Fees Notice of Appeal 5th Cir.	505.00
6/4/2019	Lit&More - Hard copies of brief to 5th Cir.	160.71
8/23/2019	Lit&More - Hard copies of reply to 5th Cir.	105.45

### Case 1:17-cv-00538-LY Document 85-1 Filed 03/20/20 Page 34 of 34

		12/4/2019	11/5/2019	11/5/2019
TOTAL	FedEx Deliveries (x6)	Renaissance New Orleans Arts Warehouse - Lodging for R. Walters & R. Henneke to attend oral argument	Southwest Airlines - Roundtrip airfare for R. Walters to attend oral argument in New Orleans	Southwest Airlines - Roundtrip airfare for R. Henneke to attend oral argument in New Orleans
8454.42	150.00	431.95	157.96	157.96